

# **BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES**

**May 10, 2001**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Walter Lemon III called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

**ROLL CALL:** Present were Chairman Walter Lemon III; Board Members Hal Beighley, Monty Edberg, Ronald Nardoza, Ashetra Prentice and Stewart Straus. Board Member Anissa Crane was excused.

Senior Planner John Osterberg, Associate Planner Scott Whyte and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

Chairman Lemon read the format for the meeting.

Mr. Beighley indicated that due to a conflict of interest, he would not be participating in the decision for BDR 2000-0129 – Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation District Ball Fields at Merlo Road and 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Observing that he had personally worked with the consultants for BDR 2001-0021/ADJ 2001-0001 – Beaverton Town Square Retail Building Type 3 Design Review and Adjustment, Mr. Edberg indicated that this would not affect his decision in any way.

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

### **CONTINUANCE:**

Associate Planner Scott Whyte indicated that the applicant has requested a continuance until July 12, 2001. He pointed out that this item would also be on the May 24, 2001 agenda, adding that it should be continued at that time as well. On question, he advised Chairman Lemon that although the Planning Commission had approved the CUP, two of the neighbors have appealed the decision to the City Council.

Chairman Lemon discussed the previous Board of Design Review Meeting, at which time this application had not been approved as submitted, adding that the

applicant had taken the opportunity to continue the Public Hearing at that time and waived the 120-day rule.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion that BDR 2000-0185 – Murray Hills Christian Church Addition Type 3 Design Review be continued to a date certain of July 12, 2001.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

Mr. Osterberg mentioned that there has been a request from the applicant to continue BDR 2000-0168 – Lanphere Auto Sales and Service Type 3 Design Review to a date certain of June 14, 2001.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

### **VISITORS:**

Chairman Lemon asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item.

**FRANK PARISI** discussed his efforts on behalf of a large format retailer looking for property within the City of Beaverton, observing that the intent is not town center or regional center, but just plain commercial sites. Observing that he is attempting to obtain information, he further stated that the retailer he represents would like to obtain approximately fifteen acres of property to allow for a building of approximately 80,000 to 100,000 square feet.

Mr. Straus questioned whether the locations to which Mr. Parisi is referring are within visual distance of single-family residences.

Mr. Parisi informed Mr. Straus that while one of the sites is within visual distance of single-family residences, the other site is not.

Mr. Straus advised Mr. Parisi that visibility is generally the most prevalent objection to such development.

Mr. Parisi requested to appear before the board again to further discuss locations and issues regarding large-format retail.

Mr. Straus advised Mr. Parisi to schedule this issue with staff on an evening when the agenda is not too long.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

Chairman Lemon opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the meeting. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience

challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. BDR2001-0031-QWEST WIRELESS MONOPOLE @ 10700 SW BEAVERTON HILLSDALE HWY**

Request for Design Review approval for the placement of a telecommunications facility consisting of a monopole, a total of 80 feet in height with five foot lighting rod extension, panel antennas and ground-mounted equipment cabinets. The site proposed for placement of the facility is addressed at 10700 SW Beaverton Hillsdale Highway; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-15AD on Tax Lot 2000. The site is zoned Industrial Park (IP) and is approximately 2.92 acres in size. Within the IP zone, facilities related to utility distribution are permitted with Conditional Use approval.

Mr. Whyte presented the Staff Report and described the application for the placement of a monopole and related equipment at the subject site. He requested that the Board omit certain language as proposed in one of the Conditions of Approval requiring the equipment enclosure to be painted light gray. He observed that the Planning Commission had approved the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) on the previous evening with no opposition. He noted that there is no request for landscaping at this time, and that the facility is to be located in an existing concrete storage area. Concluding, he offered to respond to any questions or comments.

Mr. Straus questioned the rationale for the change in the painting of equipment.

Observing that it is not necessary, Mr. Whyte advised Mr. Straus that it should not have been included.

**APPLICANT:**

**KEVIN MARTIN**, representing *Qwest Wireless*, stated that the applicant concurs with the Staff Report, finds the recommended Conditions of Approval acceptable, and offered to respond to any questions or comments.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

No member of the public appeared to testify regarding this application.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2001-0031 – Qwest Wireless Monopole at 10700 SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated May 3, 2001, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 6, with an amendment to Condition of Approval No. 2, as follows:

2. All construction shall be carried out in accordance with the elevations and plans marked "Exhibit B". (On file at City Hall). All antennas shall be flush-mounted to the pole. The pole ~~and equipment enclosure~~ shall be painted light gray.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

**B. BEAVERTON TOWN SQUARE RETAIL BUILDING**

The following land use applications have been submitted for the construction of a retail building. The development proposal is located on the north side of SW Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway, west of the entrance driveway to the Fred Meyer store within the Beaverton Town Square shopping center; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-15AB on Tax Lots 1100, 1200, 2000, and 2100. The proposed retail building would be specifically located on Tax Lot 1200 which is approximately 1.59 acres in size and is zoned Regional Center East (RC-E). In addition, the subject site area is located within the Floodplain District overlay zone.

**1. BDR2001-0021: Type III Design Review**

Request for Design Review approval for construction of a retail building approximately 21,000 square feet in size. The retail building is designed with a raised foundation allowing the passage of floodwater underneath the building. The proposal includes minor site grading, construction of a parking area and associated landscaping.

**2. ADJ2001-0001: Adjustment Application**

Request for an adjustment to the Development Standards requiring development in the Regional Center zone to have at least one primary building entrance oriented toward a Major Pedestrian Route. Primary entrances to the proposed retail building would be oriented to the Beaverton Town Square parking lot, away from Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway, which is designated a Major Pedestrian Route.

Mr. Whyte presented the Staff Reports and materials board and described the applications for the construction of a 21,000 square foot retail building on the north side of Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway within the Beaverton Town Square Shopping Center. He discussed issues related to the applications, such as landscaping and parking, and described the applicable approval criteria. He

recommended that the design review application be denied based upon the findings related to criterion “a”, adding that the applicant has the opportunity to request a continuance in order to address certain issues. Concluding, he offered to respond to any questions or comments.

On question, Mr. Whyte advised Mr. Straus that the staff recommendation of denial is based upon an evaluation of the proposal compared with the existing *Beaverton Town Square*, particularly the exterior finish materials.

Mr. Straus emphasized that it is essential to tie the appearance of the development in with the architectural structure of the existing *Beaverton Town Square*.

On question, Mr. Whyte observed that while there is no actual physical connection, there would be a pedestrian path connection to the existing arcade element of *Beaverton Town Square*.

#### **APPLICANT:**

**JERRY OFFER**, representing *OTAK, Inc.*, **ROBERT MCGILL**, representing the owner of the proposed development, and **SINAN GUMUSOGLU**, the architect for the proposed development introduced themselves.

Mr. Offer pointed out that this *Beaverton Town Center* has been partitioned off from the *Fred Meyer* property and is owned by another entity. Noting that the applicant and prospective purchaser of this site is *Pacific One Properties*, he emphasized that the proposal involves what he referred to as a “speculative retail building”. Pointing out that this creates some difficulties, he clarified that the developer does not know for certain at this time who the end user will be, although there have been several interested parties. He discussed the primary access from the main entrance off of Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, noting that this area is presently parking and landscaping that includes a catch basin that forms a sort of a valley. Observing that this property is located within the 100-year floodplain and that the adjustment request to compensate for this situation is motivated by this floodplain issue, he noted that the site is zoned for commercial development. Pointing out that a portion of Fanno Creek routes through Griffith Park across the street, he mentioned that it actually passes through the *Beaverton Town Square* site by means of a storm sewer. He also indicated that the applicant is willing to continue the Public Hearing and return with their engineer at that time, if necessary. He discussed the proposed entrances on the east side, the west side and the north side of the proposed development, emphasizing that this is a speculative building and it is not possible to determine at this time exactly how the space would be utilized. He mentioned that Mr. Gumusoglu would more fully describe the proposed building itself and the changes that have been made in the past week since staff had advised them of the decision to recommend denial of the design review application.

Noting that metal is utilized in the *Fred Meyer Store* and brick in the *Beaverton Town Square*, Mr. Gumusoglu indicated that the development would use both of these materials in order to coordinate with the existing development.

Referring to an existing purchase agreement, Mr. Offer pointed out that the ownership of this property and development would be *Beaverton Town Square* rather than *Fred Meyer*.

Observing that the proposed building would have four very distinctive edges, Mr. Gumusoglu described what he referred to as the most visible edge at the corner of the Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway at the entrance to *Fred Meyer*. Noting that the applicant wants to avoid cluttering the area with signage, he mentioned that particular areas have been designated for certain signs. He discussed landscaping and shrubbery and described screening for any mechanical equipment that would be located on the roof, adding that storage would be a major challenge.

Mr. Straus questioned whether illustrations of the existing *Beaverton Town Square* are available.

Mr. Gumusoglu suggested taking a walk across the street to look at the site.

Mr. Whyte pointed out that staff has a very amateurish video available.

Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that the proposed building has a more “techy” appearance and different feel than that of a town center, observing that this might be more appropriate on Sunset Highway with other technical type buildings. He commented that this building, as proposed, does not fulfill the intent of becoming the concluding piece to the rest of this existing complex.

Mr. Offer pointed out that the applicant had attempted to emulate some of the architecture of the town square, adding that while there is a high-tech appearance, there are also some similarities to the existing structures.

Mr. Straus expressed his concern with the appearance of the proposed development to the casual observer.

Mr. Gumusoglu explained that the applicant would like this development to serve as a sort of a transition between the *Fred Meyer Store* and the existing *Beaverton Town Square*.

Chairman Lemon referred to Mr. Beighley’s comment that the storefronts at the town center don’t reach the floor.

Mr. Offer pointed out that each tenant would have a lease, adding that while there would be unique storefronts, each would require approval.

On question, Mr. Whyte advised Mr. Straus that depending upon the significance of the change, any change to the storefronts could require a Type 1 Review.

Ms. Prentice pointed out that while she likes the design, a visit to the site would be helpful in making a decision.

Mr. Offer suggested taking a few moments to step outside and view the proposed site.

Mr. Osterberg pointed out that it is permissible for the Board to take a brief recess to inspect the site, emphasizing that any discussion would need to occur after the meeting is reconvened.

7:54 p.m. to 8:04 p.m. – the Board recessed in order to walk across the street to inspect the site.

Chairman Lemon pointed out that many of the storefronts have some sort of opaque panels, expressing his opinion that the overall design is not actually compatible with that of the *Fred Meyer Store*.

Observing that she likes the design and think it fits in the area, Ms. Prentice expressed her concern that there is no adequate street access for pedestrians.

Mr. Gumusoglu described requirements for handicapped access at every major entrance and explained compromises that had been made in order to fulfill these requirements.

Following a discussion regarding handicapped accessibility, Mr. Straus pointed out that until the future tenants are determined, many aspects of this situation are only speculation. He expressed his concern with the design character of street frontage and future pedestrian access.

Observing that all tenants prefer to be closest to parking, Mr. Offer commented that he anticipates that the building would have one, two or three tenants.

Mr. Offer mentioned the City's requirements regarding glazing as a design standard in the respective zone where the building is proposed.

Mr. Gumusoglu commented that a minimum of 50% glazing is required at the back along SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, adding that the planting could be brought to the edge of the paving to allow for greater connectivity to occur.

Mr. Edberg questioned whether any other options for the location of the trash enclosure had been considered.

Mr. Gumusoglu assured Mr. Edberg that the applicant had considered other options for the location of the trash enclosure, adding that no feasible alternative had been found.

Chairman Lemon expressed his opinion that the overall feel of the majority of the Board is to provide staff with specific instructions, when possible, adding that the applicant should consider opting for a continuance until May 24, 2001.

Mr. Straus questioned whether the existing *Fred Meyer Store* monument sign would remain in its current location.

Mr. Gumusoglu advised Mr. Straus that the existing *Fred Meyer Store* monument sign would be removed.

Mr. Offer mentioned that the sign would be relocated to *Fred Meyer Store's* own location.

Mr. Straus mentioned that this particular sign has an interesting history.

Mr. Offer pointed out that the applicant is seeking additional direction from the Board, specifically whether certain changes should be made to their design.

Mr. Beighley and Ms. Prentice informed Mr. Offer that they would like to see a variation in the brick to be included in the design.

Chairman Lemon suggested some raised planters within the Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway setback, adding that some staggered shrubs and trees that provide more than just groundcover should break up the space a little.

Mr. Straus suggested providing a recessed area within the landscaped area off of the sidewalk for people waiting at the bus stop.

Mr. Beighley referred to the proposed landscaping, expressing his opinion that more appropriate options are available.

Chairman Lemon questioned whether the applicant would like to submit a request to continue both items.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr. Offer requested that both items be continued.

Chairman Lemon questioned whether it is necessary to provide notification regarding this continuance.

Mr. Whyte assured Chairman Lemon that notification of this continuance is not necessary, advised the applicant that it would be necessary to submit a revised plan set with notes by 4:00 p.m. Thursday, May 24, 2001.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Straus **SECONDED** a motion to continue BDR 2001-0021 – Beaverton Town Square Retail Building Type 3 Design Review and ADJ 2001-0001 – Beaverton Town Square Retail Building Adjustment to date certain of May 24, 2001.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

8:32 p.m. – Mr. Whyte left.

**D. BDR 2000-0129 - TUALATIN HILLS PARKS & RECREATION DISTRICT BALL FIELDS AT MERLO AND 170TH**

This proposal is to create a football field, a soccer field, and three baseball/softball fields at the southeast corner of SW Merlo Drive and 170th Avenue; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-06DD on portions of Tax Lot's 700, 800, and 900. The affected parcel is zoned Station Community-Multiple Use (SC-MU) and is approximately 8.43 acres in size.

Mr. Osterberg presented the Staff Report and described the application providing for five new ball fields at Merlo Road and 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue, observing that this proposal by Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD) to utilize property that they are leasing from the Tualatin Valley Water Department (TVWD). He noted that there has been an agreement with both TVWD and the Beaverton School District to provide for parking, pointing out that because the park district activities at this location end at dusk, there are no provisions for lighting. Concluding, he recommended approval of the application, with certain Conditions of Approval, and offered to respond to any questions or comments.

**APPLICANT:**

**DAWN HARTMAN**, representing THPRD, concurred with the facts and findings in the Staff Report and agreed with the recommended Conditions of Approval.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

No member of the public appeared to testify regarding the application.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Nardoza **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2000-0129 – Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation District Ball Fields at Merlo and 170th Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated May 3, 2001, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 4.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Mr. Beighley, who abstained from voting on this issue.

On question, Mr. Osterberg advised Chairman Lemon that he would find out whether members of the public are permitted to submit a yellow testimony card and testify following the applicant's rebuttal for an application.

Referring to the Historic Building Committee, Mr. Osterberg questioned whether any member of the Board of Design Review is willing to volunteer as the liaison for the Public Hearing on May 31, 2001 regarding the proposed demolition of the *Henry House*.

Mr. Nardozza volunteered to serve in this capacity.

Chairman Lemon expressed his appreciation to Mr. Nardozza for volunteering to provide this service.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes of April 12, 2000, as written, were submitted. Chairman Lemon asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Mr. Edberg, who abstained from voting on this issue.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.